

REMARKS

The Office Action of December 10, 2003, rejected claims 1-10, 14-22 and 24-32 as being obvious from the disclosure of U.S. Patent 6,429,947 to Lavery in view of the disclosure of U.S. Patent 6,611,348 to Chase.

The Lavery patent has its primary focus on preparing printed materials using CMYK printers of large volumes. Preparing the color separation files and the like is done electronically and can be shown to the customer who is commissioning the print job to verify his acceptance before the large volume paper printing job is completed. While that customer commissioning the print job may be viewing information over the Internet; that is a private connection and is not one made available to the public. Lavery is strictly focused on the process of preparing large volumes of printed materials on CMYK printers.

The Chase, et al. patent is similarly directed. See for example column 1, lines 9-12 in which the Chase system is said to relate "generally to the field of publishing and printing, more particularly, the present invention relates to a system and method providing publishing and printing services via a communications network. Neither Chase, et al. or Lavery is focused on making catalog web pages available on the Internet, particularly in a fashion of providing fidelity to printed materials separately being produced for CMYK printing. Finally, neither Chase, et al. or Lavery has any disclosure or suggestion to make the images remotely available to the public on the Internet for viewing on a monitor and printing on RGB printers.

These features now are clearly outlined in the claims, and therefore the claims differentiate from the cited references in a patentable fashion. Not only are the claims not anticipated, there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the prior art to reach the subject matter of Applicant's claims, so that it is not proper to say that the claimed invention would have been obvious from Lavery or Chase, et al. either.


Applicant notes that in its post final filing, a similar argument was made which was not accepted by way of the advisory action. Applicant has subsequently had a telephone interview with the Examiner and his supervisor Ms. Brier, resulting in refinement of the claim language herein presented. In particular, Ms. Brier pointed out that for, example, in claim 1,

the viewing would be on a computer monitor and the printing on a printer, so that the claims have been clarified that the viewing is on a monitor and the printing is on a printer.

The claims have also been amended to specify that the desktop printer is an RGB desktop printer to make particularly clear that the printing is not the bulk CMYK printing that is the subject of the Lavery patent.

It is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance and same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any further small matters requiring resolution, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned for expeditious handling.

Respectfully submitted,



Howard A. MacCord, Jr.
Registration No. 28,639
MacCord Mason PLLC
P. O. Box 2974
Greensboro, NC 27402
(336) 273-4422

Date: April 8, 2004
File No.: 8012-001

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST-CLASS MAIL, IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: **COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450**, ON April 8, 2004

(Date of Deposit)

Christian E. Carter

Name of Depositor



Signature

April 8, 2004

Date of Signature